REMARKS

Claims 1-79 are pending after this amendment. Claims 1, 3, 6, 11-18, 20-25, 27, 40-42, 44, 46, 49, 55-59, 61-63, 67, 68, and 74-79 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

The amendments and remarks presented herein are in response to the Office Action dated October 5, 2006.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-19, 21-54, 56-73, and 75-79 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper in view of Cotte. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, which has been amended merely to clarify the nature of the invention, recites:

> "A computer-implemented method for processing a stored document, comprising:
> receiving an image of a document index;
> locating, on the document index image, an image of a first sticker specifying an action;
> identifying a first stored document based on the location of the first action sticker with respect to the document index image; and
> performing the specified first action to cause a change to the identified first stored document."

As discussed in the previous Response, claim 1 recites specific steps for performing an action to cause a change to a stored document. A document index image includes an image of a first sticker. The sticker specifies an action to be performed.

The location of the sticker with respect to the document index image identifies the stored document on which the action is to be performed. The use of a sticker in this manner avoids the need for accepting input from users in a conventional way. Once the action and target have been discerned, the action is performed, causing the appropriate change to take place to the identified document.

The recited steps therefore include, among others, identifying a document based on a sticker location with respect to a document index image. No such step is taught or suggested in either of the cited references. The Examiner stated that Cooper combined with Cotte teach such a step.

To the contrary, neither of the references, taken alone or in any combination, teaches identifying a document based on a sticker location with respect to a document index image. Cooper does not even mention stickers, being directed instead to techniques for assigning a file label to a file. Furthermore, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Cooper does not teach the use of a document index image in the manner claimed. The Examiner stated that "Cooper teaches the use of a coversheet ('document image index') to access documents that are stored on a computer, and processing the documents as indicated." To the contrary, neither of the terms "coversheet" nor "document image index" even appear anywhere in Cooper.

The Examiner cited nearly four full columns of Cooper (col. 1, line 8 through col. 4, line 59) in support of the position that Cooper teaches the recited claim limitations, without indicating with any specificity where such teachings appear in this

long section of Cooper. Nevertheless, Applicants have reviewed Cooper and have ascertained that no such teachings are provided. Rather, the cited section of Cooper merely discusses elements such as labeling a document for storage, manipulation, and retrieval (col. 1, lines 8-12); scanning, remote document access, and naming of files stored in a data processing resource (col. 1, lines 13-27); definitions of terminology such as computer, workstation, document, file, and the like (col. 1, lines 28-53); scanning a document to generate a bitmap (col. 1, lines 54-65); the use of file names to identify electronic documents (col. 1, line 66 to col. 2, line 38); identifying documents for retrieval by way of indicia imparted on a form, such as bar codes, check boxes, or fields (col. 2, lines 39-53); user-selected file labels based on a relationship between an image domain file label and a file name assigned by the computer (col. 3, lines 23-40); cover forms including regions in which the user can impart an image domain label for a file (col. 3, lines 41-55); transmission and storage of a data file (col. 3, lines 56-60); relationship between image domain label and data representing document (col. 3, line 61 to col. 4, line 5); accessing previously stored documents having image domain file labels (col. 4, lines 6-22); identifying a file without using optical character recognition (col. 4, lines 23-37); image domain labels assigned to files other than documents, such as a computer program or binary file (col. 4, lines 38-54).

This, it can be seen that even an exhaustively thorough reading of Cooper fails to yield any mention whatsoever of identifying a stored document based on a sticker location with respect to a document index image.

Cotte also fails to teach such a limitation. The Examiner stated that such a limitation is taught by Cotte at col. 2, line 29 through col. 3, line 54 and col. 10, line 19 through col. 14, line 48, again citing extremely long sections of the reference without indicating with any specificity where the relevant teachings allegedly appear. In the interests of advancing prosecution of this application, Applicants have thoroughly reviewed Cotte (particularly the cited portions thereof) and have determined that the reference contains no hint or suggestion of the claimed limitations.

Most of the cited portions of Cotte are completely unrelated to the claimed invention, instead describing components and operations such as scanning technology (col. 2, lines 29-53); receiving commands from the user by manual pointing to menu selections or by automatic recognition of symbols on the scanned document (col. 2, lines 54-62); physical characteristics and operation of the scanning device (col. 2, line 63 to col. 3, line 54; col. 10, lines 19-39); interrupt handling to generate a drop-down menu presenting options to a user for specifying how to handle scanned image (col. 10, lines 40-58); input stream including code to indicate what is to be done with incoming data (col. 10, lines 59-62); software architecture (col. 10, line 63 to col. 11, line 2); a process of sensing paper insertion, sending interrupt to host computer, and scanning data (col. 11, lines 3-27); and the like. Although Cotte does describe the use of stickers to specify handling of a document, the stickers are placed on the document itself (see col. 11, lines 32-34). There is no mention anywhere in Cotte of any technique where a sticker's location is used to identify which document the action

should be performed on. In particular, there is no mention of a technique where a document is identified based on a sticker location with respect to a document index image, as claimed herein.

In other words, while Cotte does teach the use of stickers, the stickers are used in an entirely different way than is the action sticker recited in claim 1. The action sticker recited herein 1) specifies an action; and 2) identifies a stored document based on the sticker location with respect to a document index image. Nowhere in Cotte is there any hint or suggestion of a sticker that is used in the manner claimed herein.

Accordingly, claim 1 is submitted to be patentably distinct from Cooper and Cotte, taken alone or in any combination.

Claim 42 recites limitations similar to those of claim 1, except that it recites receiving input specifying the action to be performed. As discussed above, neither Cooper nor Cotte teaches any technique where an action sticker's location is used to identify which document the action should be performed on. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, claim 42 is submitted to be patentably distinct from Cooper and Cotte, taken alone or in any combination.

Claim 44 is a computer program product claim that recites limitations similar to those of claim 1. Claim 63 is a system claim that recites limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, claims 44 and 63 are submitted to be patentably distinct from Cooper and Cotte, taken alone or in any combination.

Claims 2-19 and 21-41 depend from claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 1, including those discussed above. Claim 43 depends from claim 42 and incorporates all of the limitations of amended claim 42, including those discussed above. Claims 45-54 and 56-62 depend from claim 44 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 44, including those discussed above. Claims 64-73 and 75-79 depend from claim 63 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 63, including those discussed above. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, these dependent claims are submitted to be patentably distinct from Cooper and Cotte, taken alone or in any combination.

The Examiner rejected claims 20, 55, and 74 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper in view of Cotte and Johnson. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 20 depends from claim 1 and incorporates all of the limitations of amended claim 1, including those discussed above. As discussed above, neither Cooper nor Cotte teach or suggest the use of action stickers as claimed herein. Johnson does nothing to cure this deficiency, being directed merely to the use of a form to request automatic creation of a form.

Furthermore, claim 20 also teaches that "the specified first action comprises specifying an access level for the first stored document." Johnson does not teach this limitation. The Examiner cited various portions of Johnson; however, this teaching

cannot be found in any of these portions. Specifically, Fig. 7 and col. 16, line 55 through col. 17, line 36 describe entry of a security code, but do not teach or suggest any mechanism for specifying an access level for a document. Applicants respectfully point out that specifying an access level is entirely distinct from entering a security code. There is no mention, in Johnson, of setting individuals' access permissions to certain activities, as asserted by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Examiner stated that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art at the time of the invention that a personalized security access code would have been able to be used with more than one level of secure access." Applicants respectfully disagree, pointing out that the claim language explicitly recites specifying an access level, whereas Johnson merely describes entering an access code. Specifying an access level means indicating what level of access (e.g. of a number of access levels) will be permitted; for example, a read-only access level might be specified, so that only read access (and not write access) is permitted). No such technique is described in Johnson; rather, Johnson merely allows a user to mark a security code segment to indicate a code, so that the entered code can be compared against a previously stored code. In short, Johnson merely describes an authentication method by which the person filling out the form can provide a security code so that the form will be accepted. This is entirely different from an action sticker that permits an access level to be specified for a document, as claimed herein.

Accordingly, claim 20 is respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited references, taken alone or in any combination.

Claims 55 and 74 recite limitations similar to those of claim 20 and are hereby submitted to be patentable over the cited references, taken alone or in any combination.

On the basis of the above amendments, consideration of this application and the early allowance of all claims herein are requested.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss the above amendments and remarks, or if the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' representative would help to advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,
John Barrus, Stephen Savitzky,
and Kurt Wesley Piersol

Dated: December 27, 2006

By: /Amir H. Raubvogel/
Amir H. Raubvogel
Reg. No. 37,070
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7276
Fax: (650) 938-5200